



IDAHO WATER RESOURCE BOARD

L. "Butch" Otter
Governor

MINUTES OF TELEPHONIC BOARD MEETING NO. 12-08

Boise, Idaho
October 6, 2008

Jerry R. Rigby
Chairman
Rexburg
At Large

Chairman Rigby called meeting 12-08 to order at 10:00 a.m. and requested roll call.

Terry T. Uhling
Vice Chairman
Boise
District 2

Agenda Item No. 1, Roll Call

Board Members by Phone

Bob Graham
Secretary
Bonners Ferry
At Large

Jerry Rigby, Chairman
Gary Chamberlain
Chuck Cuddy
Terry Uhling, absent

Vic Armacost
Claude Storer
Bob Graham
Leonard Beck

**Charles "Chuck"
Cuddy**
Orofino
District 1

Guests by Phone

Jon Bowling, Idaho Power
Jonathan Bartsch, CDR Associates
Harriet Hensley, Deputy Attorney General
Peter Anderson, Trout Unlimited

Leonard Beck
Burley
District 3

Staff Members Attending

L. Claude Storer
Idaho Falls
District 4

Patsy McGourty, Admin. Asst.
Hal Anderson, Administrator
Bob McLaughlin, Public Information Officer
Brian Patton, Bureau Chief
Helen Harrington, Section Manager

**Gary M.
Chamberlain**
Challis
At Large

Agenda Item No. 2, Public Comment

There was no public comment.

**Lawrence "Vic"
Armacost**
New Meadows
At Large

Agenda Item No. 3, Update ESPA CAMP Process

Mr. Anderson stated that this meeting was called to discuss the draft of a proposed Phase I Plan that is a product of the ESPA CAMP process. He turned the meeting over to Mr. Bartsch to go over the draft plan.

Mr. Bartsch thanked the Board for the opportunity to brief them on the draft Phase I Plan. This plan is for the first five years of the ESPA management plan. A Sub-Committee has met several times to compile Phase I actions that have been reviewed by the Advisory Committee and they overwhelmingly support the plan. A meeting is set for October 10th in Jerome to finalize the funding options for Phase I actions. Mr. Bartsch asked if everyone had a copy of the draft.

Mr. Bartsch began on page 6 Hydrologic Targets and Additional CAMP Recommendations (1-5 years). Mr. Bartsch apologized for not getting the draft to them sooner; however, he was still adding comments the night before this meeting. He complimented everyone involved in the negotiations for this document.

Mr. Bartsch discussed the Phase I actions and goals. The estimated cost is between \$7 and \$10 million dollars annually for 5 years or \$35 to \$50 million total. The first action is groundwater to surface water conversion. The goal is 100 kaf annual average over 5 years. He discussed the various actions and issues. Mr. Anderson suggested dropping the word "soft" conversions and referring to them as conversions since they include both hard and soft. He continued to discuss the actions of managed recharge and incidental recharge. He noted the goal of no reduction in incidental recharge over the next 5 years.

Mr. Bartsch discussed the goal of demand reduction including actions and issues involving fallowing, dry-year lease options, and CREP Program Enhancements. Another component of demand reduction is surface water conservation including check structures, automated gates and investigating reducing transmission losses. These action items are actually pilot projects with a goal of 5,000 af of groundwater reduction over five years but no target was set for surface consummation.

Finally, Mr. Bartsch discussed a proposed pilot weather modification program with state, local and other agency support. Idaho Power is willing to take the lead on this program to help implement an experimental project. The final action involves reviewing administrative rules that might be an impediment to putting CAMP options into practice. Mr. Bartsch asked for Board members input on these actions.

Chairman Rigby noted that the Committee of Nine had met and discussed these proposals. Mr. Cuddy asked what the outlook was for the CREP program. Mr. Bartsch responded that the hope is to increase incentives to get more acres into the program. Mr. Anderson noted that there is still federal money available and the Board has money available for this program. He discussed ideas to maximize this program. Staff have not seen increased interest at this time due to high commodity prices.

Mr. Armacost asked if the cost of \$7-10 million was for each of five years. Mr. Bartsch noted it was. Mr. Anderson noted that the \$7-10 million was a twenty-year payout of \$100,000,000, but

there was not a commitment of \$7-10 million beyond the first five years. He stated that capitol investments would probably need twenty years payout. Mr. Bartsch noted that after these actions are implemented, other actions will be more expensive. The actions in Phase I are the most cost-effective with the highest return as determined by the Advisory Committee. Mr. Anderson agreed that the first half of the plan is the easiest and cheapest.

Mr. Armacost noted that there was no mention of increasing storage efficiency and no mention of a flood control benefit from recharge. He also thought that the storage studies currently underway should be noted in Phase I.

Mr. Bartsch responded that the additional surface water storage component was outlined in the overall framework; however, it was not identified in Phase I. Mr. Armacost and Mr. Anderson thought they should be included.

Mr. Storer asked about tributary recharge using natural flow in upper basin tributaries for supply downstream. Mr. Anderson stated this was brought up from the environmental committee who are working on determining how the Phase I plan may affect fish, wildlife, water quality and hydropower. Peter Anderson from Trout Unlimited who was on the line addressed a conceptual program for tributary flow enhancement stating it was similar to the Wood River Legacy Project where upstream water rights were transferred for downstream projects. Water users might be willing to sell water at various locations.

Mr. Storer asked if the intention was to trade natural flow for storage. Mr. Peter Anderson responded that water right users could sell to users below. Mr. Hal Anderson explained to Mr. Storer that in the Wood River Legacy Project water upstream was used downstream for a specific flow enhancement but below Magic Reservoir was available to senior water users.

Chairman Rigby asked what action the Board needed today. Mr. Bartsch responded that he was just presenting the draft to the Board. The next step will be to define specific water right users' commitment. The next telephonic Board meeting on October 29th will involve reviewing the draft plan. A final draft document will be presented to the Board at their meeting November 6th.

Mr. Bartsch asked if there were any major objections to the draft recommendations. He asked if the Board could support the draft of Phase I. Mr. Graham noted that if there were no major objections in the Advisory Committee, this draft of Phase I may be ready for final. Mr. Bartsch discussed the last Advisory Committee meeting and the response he got to this draft Phase I plan. The funding element remains to be finalized at the Oct. 10th meeting in Jerome. Mr. Graham and Chairman Rigby both agreed that funding would be the big issue. Mr. Bartsch stated there will need to be a big water user contribution to finance this effort.

Mr. Bartsch pointed out to Board members that this draft of Phase I is written from the Board's perspective to present to the Legislature.

Mr. Anderson stated the Board is set to meet in Boise on Nov. 5th. The State Water Plan meeting is set for Oct. 27th. The Board agreed to meet on Oct. 29th at 8:30 a.m. by teleconference.

Mr. Bartsch stated that the final document will be longer. Mr. Anderson noted that the Board would have from Oct. 29 until Nov. 4th to review the draft document for final approval.

Mr. Armacost noted that the three major universities have a grant to look at climate change. He thought they should take a look at the weather modification actions. He also suggested that the Implementation Committee should be general enough to allow for changing members or increasing members. Mr. Bartsch suggested amending the language to allow for changes or increases.

Agenda Item No. 4, Other Items Board Members May Wish to Present

Mr. Cuddy asked if staff would have time to present to the legislative committee between November 4 and the first of January. Mr. Anderson responded that the Natural Resource Interim Legislative Committee will meet in mid-November to consider the Board's Plan. Several legislators have participated in the committee meetings.

Mr. Bartsch added that ESPA CAMP public meetings will be set in early December in Idaho Falls, Pocatello and Twin Falls.

Agenda Item No. 5, Adjourn

Mr. Chamberlain moved to adjourn; Mr. Graham seconded. All were in favor.

Dated this 12th day of November, 2008.



Secretary



Patsy McGourty, Administrative Assistant II

Board Actions:

No Board actions were taken.